UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/612,427	07/01/2003	Joseph M. Hanners	60027.0330US01/BS030153	6510

23552   7590   10/04/2007
MERCHANT & GOULD PC
P.O. BOX 2903
MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55402-0903

EXAMINER
DENNISON, JERRY B

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2143	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
10/04/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Office Action Summary	10/612,427	HANNERS ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	J. Bret Dennison	2143	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>01 July 2003</u>.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-20* is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☒ Claim(s) *20* is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-6, 8-15 and 17-19* is/are rejected.

7)☒ Claim(s) *7 and 16* is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

      1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

      3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1)☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3)☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.

5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application

6)☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1.   This Action is in response to Application Number 10/612,427 received on 01 July

2003.

2.   Claims 1-20 are presented for examination.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

3.   Claims 10-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is

directed to non-statutory subject matter.

4.   Claim 10 recites a "computer-readable medium" in the preamble of the claim.

Applicant's instant specification recites,

"Although the description of computer-readable media contained herein refers to

a mass storage device, such as a hard disk or CD-ROM drive, it should be appreciated

by those skilled in the art that computer-readable media can be any available media that

can be accessed by the client computer 2.

By way of example, and not limitation, computer-readable media may comprise

computer storage media <u>and communication media</u>."

Therefore, Applicant's instant specification provides evidence that Applicant

intends "computer-readable medium" to not be limited to just tangible embodiments, but

instead defining it as including both tangible embodiments (e.g., "computer storage

media") and intangible embodiments (e.g., "<u>communication media</u>"). As such, the claim

is not limited to statutory subject matter and is therefore non-statutory. Claims 11-18

depend from claim 10, and are therefore also non-statutory.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

5.   Claims 1-6, 8-15, 17-19 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable

over King et al. (U.S. 5,958,013) in view of Cascio et al. (U.S. 2002/0091818).

6.   Regarding claim 1, King disclosed a method of managing a host session on a

remote computer in a computer system, the method comprising:

sending a request to establish the host session from a client computer (King, col.

12, lines 10-11, King disclosed the user initiating a session with a host; col. 12, lines 36-

38, King disclosed the data stream sent to the host), the request including a

presentation space (King, col. 12, lines 14-16, King disclosed instantiating the session

object also instantiates the presentation space object),

receiving in the presentation space a response to the request from the remote

computer, the response including host screen data (King, col. 12, lines 45-50, King

disclosed the host modifying the host screen data in the presentation space object and

returning it to the client);

King did not explicitly state wherein the client computer has access to a plurality of properties files defining a plurality of screens for the host session;

identifying the response by comparing the host screen data in the presentation space to screen data defined in at least one of the plurality of properties files for the host session; and

performing an action based on the identified response.

In an analogous art, Cascio disclosed a rules-based extraction method in which presentation space data streams (Cascio, [0019]) sent from a legacy host application to a user's workstation are compared to user specified rules until a match is detected, and when a match is detected, extracting data according to the matching rule (Cascio, [0025]). Cascio disclosed that the components of the rules may specify textual patterns, data and element patterns, and/or a combination of such (Cascio, [0027]).

The teachings of King and Cascio are analogous art because they both disclose the teachings of a communication session between a host and client using terminal emulation information in terms of 3270 data streaming applications which use screen-type user interfaces to display and receive data (King, col. 6, lines 30-37; Cascio, [0049]-[0050]). While King provides for establishing a session and the transfer of presentation space/screen data, King also suggests methods for extracting the presentation space data (King, col. 10, lines 54-56). Cascio provides a method for extracting the presentation space data in a more efficient way of handling this received data, specified to the user's needs (Cascio, [0025]).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the rules-based customizable data extraction teachings of Cascio into the teachings of King to provide users with an improved technique for extracting complex data components from the host screen data or presentation spaces and provide an efficient, easy to use solution that can be used by those without programming skills and which is easily customizable, and which makes the extracted data available in an easily extensible format, such that it can be used in a wide variety of environments without requiring the user to understand environment specific programming (Cascio, [0018]).

7.   Regarding claim 2, King and Cascio disclosed the limitations, substantially as claimed, as described in claim 1, including wherein the plurality of properties files includes at least one screen properties file for defining the screen data for the host session (Cascio, [0027], Cascio disclosed the components of the rules may specify textual patterns, data and element patterns, and/or a combination of such). See motivation above.

8.   Regarding claim 3, King and Cascio disclosed the limitations, substantially as claimed, as described in claim 2, including wherein the at least one screen properties file comprises a responses section (Cascio, [0047], Cascio disclosed upon detecting a match between the data in an incoming data stream and a target rule, an output document is created). See motivation above.

9.   Regarding claim 4, King and Cascio disclosed the limitations, substantially as

claimed, as described in claim 3, including wherein the responses section comprises:

        a response type for the response (Cascio, [0052], Cascio disclosed templates);

and

        identifying text for the response (Cascio, [0055], Cascio disclosed one of the data

patterns is a text pattern). See motivation above.

10.   Regarding claim 5, King and Cascio disclosed the limitations, substantially as

claimed, as described in claim 4, including wherein the response type is one of success,

analyze, and reject (Cascio, [0047], Cascio disclosed upon detecting a match, an output

document is created, therefore, when a match is found it is considered a success). See

motivation above.

11.   Regarding claim 6, King and Cascio disclosed the limitations, substantially as

claimed, as described in claim 4, including wherein identifying the response by

comparing the host screen data in the presentation space to screen data defined in at

least one of the plurality of properties files for the host session comprises determining

the response type for the response by comparing the host screen data to the identifying

text defined for the response in the responses section of the at least one screen

properties file (Cascio, [0025] and [0027], Cascio disclosed comparing the screen data

to user defined rules, in which the rules correspond to screen data such as text and/or data element and attribute patterns). See motivation above.

12.   Regarding claim 8, King and Cascio disclosed the limitations, substantially as claimed, as described in claim 1, including wherein the plurality of properties files are Java properties files (King, col. 7, lines 5-10). See motivation above.

13.   Regarding claim 9, King and Cascio disclosed the limitations, substantially as claimed, as described in claim 1, including wherein the host session is a TN3270 host session (King, col. 6, lines 30-37; Cascio, [0049]-[0050]). See motivation above.

14.   Regarding claim 10, King disclosed a computer-readable medium having computer-executable components for managing a host session between a client computer and a remote computer in a computer system, comprising:

a program file for, sending a request to establish the host session (King, col. 12, lines 10-11, King disclosed the user initiating a session with a host; col. 12, lines 36-38, King disclosed the data stream sent to the host), the request including a presentation space (King, col. 12, lines 14-16, King disclosed instantiating the session object also instantiates the presentation space object);

receiving in the presentation space a response to the request from the remote computer, the response including host screen data (King, col. 12, lines 45-50, King

disclosed the host modifying the host screen data in the presentation space object and returning it to the client);

King did not explicitly state wherein the computer-readable medium comprises:

a plurality of properties files for defining a plurality of screens comprising screen data for the host session;

and a program file for:

identifying a response type for the response, wherein the response type is defined in at least one of the plurality of properties files; and

performing an action based on the response type.

In an analogous art, Cascio disclosed a rules-based extraction method in which presentation space data streams (Cascio, [0019]) that are sent from a legacy host application to a user's workstation are compared to user specified rules until a match is detected, and when a match is detected, extracting data according to the matching rule and outputting a document based on the matched rule (Cascio, [0025]) thereby determining a response type. Cascio disclosed that the components of the rules may specify textual patterns, data and element patterns, and/or a combination of such (Cascio, [0027]).

The teachings of King and Cascio are analogous art because they both disclose the teachings of a communication session between a host and client using terminal emulation information in terms of 3270 data streaming applications which use screen-type user interfaces to display and receive data (King, col. 6, lines 30-37; Cascio, [0049]-[0050]). While King provides for establishing a session and the transfer of

presentation space/screen data, King also suggests methods for extracting the

presentation space data (King, col. 10, lines 54-56). Cascio provides a method for

extracting the presentation space data for a more efficient way of handling this received

data, specified to the user's needs (Cascio, [0025]).

Therefore, it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the

time the invention was made to incorporate the rules-based customizable data

extraction teachings of Cascio into the teachings of King to provide users with an

improved technique for extracting complex data components from the host screen data

or presentation spaces and provide an efficient, easy to use solution that can be used

by those without programming skills and which is easily customizable, and which makes

the extracted data available in an easily extensible format such that it can be used in a

wide variety of environments without requiring environment specific programming

(Cascio, [0018]).

15.   Regarding claim 11, King and Cascio disclosed the limitations, substantially as

claimed, as described in claim 10, including wherein the plurality of properties files

includes at least one screen properties file for defining the screen data for the host

session (Cascio, [0027], Cascio disclosed the components of the rules may specify

textual patterns, data and element patterns, and/or a combination of such). See

motivation above.

16.   Regarding claim 12, King and Cascio disclosed the limitations, substantially as

claimed, as described in claim 11, including wherein the at least one screen properties

file comprises a responses section (Cascio, [0047], Cascio disclosed upon detecting a

match between the data in an incoming data stream and a target rule, an output

document is created). See motivation above.

17.   Regarding claim 13, King and Cascio disclosed the limitations, substantially as

claimed, as described in claim 12, including wherein the responses section comprises

identifying text for the response (Cascio, [0055], Cascio disclosed one of the data

patterns is a text pattern). See motivation above.

18.   Regarding claim 14, King and Cascio disclosed the limitations, substantially as

claimed, as described in claim 13, including wherein identifying a response type for the

response comprises comparing the host screen data to the identifying text defined for

the response in the responses section of the at least one screen properties file (Cascio,

[0025] and [0027], Cascio disclosed comparing the screen data to user defined rules, in

which the rules correspond to screen data such as text and/or data element and

attribute patterns). See motivation above.

19.   Regarding claim 15, King and Cascio disclosed the limitations, substantially as

claimed, as described in claim 10, including wherein the response type is one of

success, analyze, and reject (Cascio, [0047], Cascio disclosed upon detecting a match,

an output document is created, therefore, when a match is found it is considered a

success). See motivation above.

20.   Regarding claim 17, King and Cascio disclosed the limitations, substantially as

claimed, as described in claim 10, including wherein the plurality of properties files are

Java properties files (King, col. 7, lines 5-10). See motivation above.

21.   Regarding claim 18, King and Cascio disclosed the limitations, substantially as

claimed, as described in claim 10, including wherein the host session is a TN3270 host

session (King, col. 6, lines 30-37; Cascio, [0049]-[0050]). See motivation above.

22.   Regarding claim 19, King disclosed a computer system for managing a host

session, comprising:

        a remote computer in the computer system (King, Fig. 5, 140, host computer);

and

        a client computer, in communication with the remote computer (Fig. 5, 532, user

computer),

        the client computer comprising:

                a memory device for storing a program file (King, col. 7, lines 45-55, col. 8,

        lines 17-20, King disclosed the client computer running the terminal emulation

        program which clearly is located in the client computer's memory); and

a processor, functionally coupled to the memory device (King, col. 7, lines

45-55, CPU), the processor being responsive to computer-executable

instructions contained in the program file stored in the memory device and

operative to:

send a request to the remote computer to establish the host session (King,

col. 12, lines 10-11, King disclosed the user initiating a session with a host; col.

12, lines 36-38, King disclosed the data stream sent to the host), the request

including a presentation space (King, col. 12, lines 14-16, King disclosed

instantiating the session object also instantiates the presentation space object);

and

receive in the presentation space a response to the request from the

remote computer, the response including host screen data (King, col. 12, lines

45-50, King disclosed the host modifying the host screen data in the presentation

space object and returning it to the client);

King did not explicitly state wherein the client computer includes

a plurality of properties files for defining a plurality of screens comprising screen

data for the host session

identifying a response type for the response, wherein the response type is

defined in at least one of the plurality of properties files; and

performing an action based on the response type.

In an analogous art, Cascio disclosed a rules-based extraction method in which

presentation space data streams (Cascio, [0019]) that are sent from a legacy host

application to a user's workstation are compared to user specified rules until a match is detected, and when a match is detected, extracting data according to the matching rule and outputting a document based on the matched rule (Cascio, [0025]) thereby determining a response type. Cascio disclosed that the components of the rules may specify textual patterns, data and element patterns, and/or a combination of such (Cascio, [0027]).

The teachings of King and Cascio are analogous art because they both disclose the teachings of a communication session between a host and client using terminal emulation information in terms of 3270 data streaming applications which use screen-type user interfaces to display and receive data (King, col. 6, lines 30-37; Cascio, [0049]-[0050]). While King provides for establishing a session and the transfer of presentation space/screen data, King also suggests methods for extracting the presentation space data (King, col. 10, lines 54-56). Cascio provides a method for extracting the presentation space data for a more efficient way of handling this received data, specified to the user's needs (Cascio, [0025]).

Therefore, it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the rules-based customizable data extraction teachings of Cascio into the teachings of King to provide users with an improved technique for extracting complex data components from the host screen data or presentation spaces and provide an efficient, easy to use solution that can be used by those without programming skills and which is easily customizable, and which makes the extracted data available in an easily extensible format such that it can be used in a

wide variety of environments without requiring environment specific programming

(Cascio, [0018]).

Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 7, 16 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but

would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the

base claim and any intervening claims.

Claim 20 is allowed.

The prior art did not disclose, in addition to the rest of the claim limitations of the

independent claims, if the response type is reject, then printing the presentation space

to an errors file.

Conclusion

Examiner's Note: Examiner has cited particular columns and line numbers in

the references applied to the claims above for the convenience of the applicant.

Although the specified citations are representative of the teachings of the art and are

applied to specific limitations within the individual claim, other passages and figures

may apply as well. It is respectfully requested from the applicant in preparing

responses, to fully consider the references in entirety as potentially teaching all or part

of the claimed invention, as well as the context of the passage as taught by the prior art

or disclosed by the Examiner.

In the case of amending the claimed invention, Applicant is respectfully requested to indicate the portion(s) of the specification which dictate(s) the structure relied on for proper interpretation and also to verify and ascertain the metes and bounds of the claimed invention.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to J. Bret Dennison whose telephone number is (571) 272-3910. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8:30am-5pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, David A Wiley can be reached on (571) 272-3923. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

J. Bret Dennison

Patent Examiner

Art Unit 2143